ASSESSMENT REPORT: EPSTEIN CELL SURVEILLANCE FOOTAGE ANOMALY

Prepared by: Prepared and reviewed by Jeff A Pierson

Date: July 2025

Subject: One-minute Gap, Visual Anomalies, and Object Displacement in Surveillance Footage from MCC New York, Jeffrey Epstein Cell

---

I. Overview

This forensic assessment analyzes the publicly released surveillance footage purportedly showing the hallway outside Jeffrey Epstein's cell on the night of his death (August 9–10, 2019). The focus is on a specific one-minute period from 11:59:00 PM to 12:00:00 AM, during which multiple anomalies appear. These include a missing timecode segment, a visible video quality shift, a possible camera repositioning, and a change in the location of a nearby object (a small garbage can).

II. Observed Anomalies

1. Timecode Discontinuity

- **Observation:** The timestamp visible on the surveillance video skips directly from 11:58:58 PM to 12:00:00 AM.
- **Duration of Gap:** Precisely 60 seconds.
- **Forensic Significance:** A 60-second gap without transitional frames or static suggests a non-natural interruption. This is highly indicative of deliberate footage removal or overwrite rather than a DVR/NVR malfunction, which typically results in jagged time loss, multiple-frame corruption, or broader system-wide footage loss across all camera feeds.

2. Video Quality Degradation and Camera Behavior

- **Observation:** Upon resuming at 12:00:00 AM, the video exhibits a drop in clarity, increased noise, and a brief visual instability resembling auto-focus recalibration or digital re-encoding.
- **Forensic Significance:** Analog cameras do not refocus unless they are physically disturbed. Such behavior is consistent with either (a) camera tampering at the hardware level (e.g., a quick unplug-replug action or vibration), or (b) post-production processing such as re-rendering, stabilization, or recompression intended to mask edits.

3. Camera Angle or Framing Shift

- **Observation:** There appears to be a slight change in the field of view between the frames before and after the time gap.
- **Forensic Significance:** Analog systems do not typically exhibit framing changes unless the camera has been physically moved, its bracket adjusted, or the feed digitally altered.

Jeff Pierson

Inconsistent framing across a single continuous surveillance feed—especially near a missing timestamp—is suggestive of either camera repositioning or post-edit cropping.

4. Object Displacement: Garbage Can

- **Observation:** A small garbage can is visible in the footage appears to have changed position between the pre-gap and post-gap frames.
- **Forensic Significance:** Garbage cans do not move on their own. A positional change, especially within the exact window of a time gap, implies human interaction. If no authorized personnel are seen moving the object the visible footage, the conclusion must be drawn that either:
    - A person was present during the missing minute and not captured,
    - Or the scene was manipulated, reset, or staged during the gap and then re-recorded or reinserted.

III. Technical Considerations

A. Analog System Limitations

- Analog surveillance cameras use coaxial cables and independent power sources. DVR or NVR reboots do not affect camera focus, framing, or position.
- If the entire system had rebooted at 11:59 PM, all camera feeds would show disruption—not just one.

B. Power Supply Structure

- Analog systems typically utilize centralized 12V/24V power boxes. A DVR reboot would not interrupt camera function unless the power supply to the cameras themselves was cut, which would again affect all channels.

C. Post-Processing Indicators

- Signs of compression artifacts, focus resets, and object anomalies are consistent with footage tampering.
- If compression settings change suddenly, it can imply a video segment was recompressed after export, suggesting a splice or cut in.

IV. Likelihood Assessment of Possible Causes

Cause	Likelihood	Rationale
Full DVR reboot	Low	It would affect multiple cameras; analog cameras would stay powered.

Jeff Pierson

Power interruption	Very Low	Would have a broader impact; no system-wide blackout reported.
Hardware tampering (local)	Moderate	Could explain focus change and angle shift; would require physical access.
Footage deletion or replacement	High	Clean timecode jump, camera behavior change, and object shift align with post-event editing or deletion.
Scene manipulation (staging)	High	Moved garbage can and framing changes support theory of physical staging and selective re-recording.

V. Known Surveillance Systems in U.S. Federal Prisons

Federal correctional facilities use a mix of legacy analog systems and modern IP-based surveillance. Known vendors and system types include:

A. Analog & Hybrid Systems

- **Pelco DVRs**: Common in older federal prisons; analog with coaxial feeds.
- **Bosch Allegiant Matrix Switchers**: Legacy CCTV control used in many MCC/BOP facilities.

B. IP-Based & PoE Camera Systems

- **Axis Communications IP Cameras**: Widely deployed in federal retrofits; support PoE and VMS integration.
- **Avigilon Control Center (ACC) with H4/H5 IP cameras**: Modern high-resolution, AI-enabled IP systems.
- **Genetec Security Center**: Enterprise VMS used for network-based recording and access integration.

C. Recording Infrastructure

- **Honeywell MAXPRO NVRs**: Hybrid appliance-based units, used in ICE and DHS detention centers.
- **Bosch DIVAR IP Series**: Appliance NVRs with server-grade storage; often installed with BVMS.
- **Dedicated server/NAS storage with VMS software**: In newer high-security institutions, footage is retained on hardened servers running vendor-specific or open VMS platforms.

D. Power and Connectivity Architecture

- **IP Cameras**: Typically powered via PoE or PoE+ through managed switches.

Jeff Pierson

- **Analog Cameras**: Powered independently via centralized 12V or 24V power supplies.
- **Hybrid Facilities**: Use BNC-to-IP encoders (e.g., Axis M70 Series) to digitize analog feeds.

VI. Conclusion

The one-minute gap in the Epstein surveillance footage, combined with a sudden camera behavior change and object displacement, cannot be explained by a natural system event such as a DVR reboot or analog glitch. The most forensically consistent explanation is a combination of:

1. **Deliberate footage removal or overwrite**,
2. **Potential scene manipulation or re-staging during the gap**, and
3. **Post-processing to mask the edit and create plausible visual continuity.**

This assessment strongly supports the hypothesis of deliberate tampering or cover-up, and warrants further forensic review by independent video integrity experts, alongside cross-examination with logs, badge records, other camera feeds, and physical scene evidence.

Jeff Pierson